to achieve the power targets as expected. Please inform this House as to what are you going to do about this.

श्री अनन्त गंगाराम गीते : सर, वर्ष 2002-03 में हमने जो लक्ष्य तय किया था, निश्चित रूप से वह पूरा होगा। ये सारे जो प्रोजैक्ट्स हैं ... (व्यवधान) ये सारे प्रोजैक्ट्स एक साल में पूरे नहीं होते हैं। यह जो दसवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना है जिसमें जो लक्ष्य तय किया गया था, वर्ष 2003-04 में हमने 5200 मेगावाट का लक्ष्य तय किया है और वर्ष 2002-03 में भी तय किया गया था, निश्चित रूप से उसको पूरा करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है।

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, this is in view of the Government's pronouncement that they are going to achieve the eight per cent growth rate. Sir, we are in the second year of the Tenth Five Year Plan. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government has made any study, as to what should be the requirement of the power in this country to achieve this eight per cent growth rate. I would also like to know about the arrangements that the Government have made to achieve this target. Every time, we are failing to achieve targets. What exactly are the efforts being initiated by the Government to achieve this target?

श्री अनन्त गंगाराम गीते : सर, 8 परसेंट ग्रोथ रेट को पाने के लिए जो प्रयास करने हैं, उसकी विस्तृत जानकारी मेरे पास उपलब्ध नहीं है। वह जानकारी मैं सदस्य को दे दूंगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will go through the Plan document. Next Question.

Funds allocated under various schemes

*566. DR. VIJAY MALLYA: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether any monitoring mechanism has been devised for keeping a vigil on the utilization of large public funds being spent under all the programmes of the Ministry;

(b) whether recently the Ministry has reconstituted vigilance and monitoring Committees at various levels for the purpose;

(c) if so, the details thereof; and

(d) whether in view of the large quantum of funds being made available under various programmes, a comprehensive report on utilisation of funds allocated and utilised will be laid on the Table of the House?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

Government have reconstituted the Vigilance and Monitoring Committees at the State and District levels. It has been decided to dispense with Committee at the Block level. Different Schemes were being monitored by different Agencies in the past. However, the reconstituted Vigilance and Monitoring Committees will monitor all the Schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development such as the Sampoorna Gramin Rozgar Yojana (SGRY), the Swarn Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY), DRDA Administration, Watershed Development Programmes, Rural Water Supply Programme (including Sector Reform), Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC), etc.

2. The Chairman of the State Level Committee would be the Minister, Rural Development Department of the concerned State and the Secretary-In-charge of Rural Development Programmes in the State would be the Member Secretary. Four M. Ps. (Lok Sabha) and one M.P. (Rajya Sabha) representing the State/U.T to be nominated by the Union Ministry of Rural Development and five MLAs to be nominated by the State Government will be among the Members. There is also a provision for nominating representatives of the Ministry of Rural Development, Khadi and Village Industries Commission and NGOs.

3. The Chairman of the District level Vigilance and Monitoring Committee would be a Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) elected from the district and nominated by the Ministry of Rural Development. The District Collector/District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner will be the Member Secretary. All MPs (Lok Sabha) of the district and one MP (Rajya Sabha) representing the State and exercising option to be associated with the District level Committee of that district would be designated as Vice Chairman. All MLAs of the district, Chairperson of the Zilla Panchayat and all Chairpersons of Panchayat Samities will also be members. There is also provision for nominating representatives of NGOs, Social workers and SCs/STs etc.

4. The funds allocated and utilisation reported by the States under the major allocation based Schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development during the year 2002-03 are given in the Statement.

Statement

Scheme-wise Statement of Central Release and Expenditure During the year 2002-2003

(Rs. in lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the States	SGRY-I		SGRY-II		IAY	
		Central Allocation	Expenditure	Central Allocation	Expenditure	Central Allocation	Expenditure
1.	Andhra Pradesh	9451.48	12380.07	9525.83	13853.41	12070.22	16275.62
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	493.74	446.29	492.24	312.34	569.92	449.12
3.	Assam	12810.39	14652.49	12816.04	12147.40	12823.65	9317.66
4.	Bihar	18926.54	18862.92	17400.97	16145.33	32787.84	20708.01
5.	Chhattisgarh	5334.11	8495.59	3951.95	5268.12	2064.05	2194.93
6.	Goa	21.79	5.23	136.57	36.26	77.98	27.72
7.	Gujarat	3557.65	3385.91	4170.66	2624.12	3468.85	4670.68
8.	Haryana	2093.09	3832.77	2197.16	4046.24	1172.95	1683.86
9.	Himachal Pradesh	881.48	834.77	925.31	659.86	518.91	363.14
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	1090.95	786.71	1063.89	736.11	620.72	637.85
11.	Jharkhand	12035.69	4078.65	12793.29	2260.42	9633.38	2446.40
12.	Karnataka	7137.20	11106.31	6960.88	10132.60	6243.52	5781.78
13.	Kerala	3202.48	2475.34	3123.04	2142.66	3868.97	3576.24
14.	Madhya Pradesh	10359.77	14488.62	11481.35	10949.00	7202.92	6277.30
15.	Maharashtra	14108.67	10709.67	13894.00	12857.23	11077.83	10796.55
16.	Manipur	860.17	N/R	859.19	N/R	679.51	178.14
17.	Meghalaya	963.63	294.60	962.59	264.16	902.85	309.36
18.	Mizoram	222.99	256.69	222.74	240.14	216.73	130.52
19.	Nagaland	660.99	600.26	660 30	286.80	582.84	653.83
20.	Orissa	10810.67	12600.88	10542.48	12430 52	9716.97	66404.87
21.	Punjab	1017.22	978.27	2443.84	1060.57	777.00	741.84
22.	Rajasthan	5419.58	9205.88	5291.01	8993.29	3273.06	3915.40
23.	Sikkim	246.88	138.10	246.62	230.70	156.25	135.27
24.	Tamil Nadu	8357.28	12663.76	8207.15	12530.97	6061.33	10015.87
25.	Tripura	1553.21	790.76	1551.28	1234.05	1318.25	1269.49
26.	Uttar Pradesh	31940.91	28858.89	31302.41	26956.92	22100.00	15375.26
27.	Uttaranchal	2133.31	2158.91	2125.56	1844.87	2295.43	1895.77
28.	West Bengal	12013.90	12198.53	11715.86	13078.83	13026.91	10781.48
29.	A & N Island	50.27		89.61	N/R	146.82	31.76
30.	D & N Haveli	50.27	N/R	59.00	N/R	77.05	3.48
31.	Daman & Diu	1.68	N/R	28.59	0.00	31.89	6.44
32.	Delhi						
33.	Lakshadweep	3.35	N/R	44.81	5.79	2.50	2.75
34.	Pondicherry	63.68	115.60	90.82	31.01	72.90	40.55
	TOTAL	177875.02	187402.47	177378.04	173359.72	165640.00	197098.94

(Rs. in Lakh)

Sl. No.	Name of the States	SGSY		ARWSP		PMGSY	
		Central Allocation	Expenditure	Central Allocation	Expenditure	Central Allocation	Expenditure*
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3068.31	4910.62	14865.00	16275.82	9000.00	18991.00
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	127.10	47.68	4977.00	449.12	3500.00	4018.00
3.	Assam	3302.59	2207.86	8407.00	9317.66	7500.00	9514.00
4.	Bihar	7303.00	8356.25	7406.00	20708.01	15000.00	0.00
5.	Chhattisgarh	1620.58	1982.71	2443.00	2194.93	8700.00	11502.00
6.	Goa	50.00	28.68	122.00	27.72	500.00	0.00
7.	Gujarat	1154.96	1655.70	6699.00	4670.68	5000.00	5850.00
8.	Haryana	679.48	1109.00	2946.00	1683.86	2000.00	1080.00
9.	Himachal Pradesh	286.16	434.46	5643.00	363.14	6000.00	4939.00
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	354.16	426.34	12388.00	637.85	2000.00	464.00
11.	Jharkhand	2751.41	2831.29	3063.00	2446.40	11000.00	3938.00
12.	Karnataka	2317.00	2666.92	12313.00	5781.78	9500.00	5198.00
13.	Kerala	1039.63	1586.52	3698.00	3576.24	2000.00	1730.00
14.	Madhya Pradesh	3474.22	5190.54	7159.00	6314.11	21300.00	26020.00
15	Maharashtra	4580.15	5162.82	16829.00	10796.55	13000.00	4400.00
16.	Manipur	221.40	0.00	1826.00	178.14	2000.00	0.00
17.	Meghalaya	246.25	52.16	1957.00	312.86	3500.00	2178.00
18.	Mizoram	57.40	29.23	1398.00	130.52	2000.00	3634.00
19.	Nagaland	170.16	79.40	1454.00	653.83	2000.00	2139.00
20.	Orissa	3509.50	3343.10	6225.00	66404.87	17500.00	15222.00
21.	Punjab	330.22	383.43	2581.00	741.84	2500.00	4696.00
22.	Rajasthan	1759.38	2060.98	26750.00	3915.40	13000.00	17615.00
23.	Sikkim	63.55	86.57	597.00	135.27	2000.00	1370.00
24.	Tamil Nadu	2713.06	3588.32	6358.00	10015.87	8000.00	5388.00
25.	Tripura	399.75	697.06	1734.00	1269.49	2500.00	0.00
26.	Uttar Pradesh	10509.37	11108.20	13022.00	15375.26	31500.00	24127.00
27.	Uttaranchal	552.30	829.56	3083.00	1895.77	6000.00	1335.00
28.	West Bengal	3900.11	4325.29	8545.00	10781.48	13500.00	4282.00
29.	A & N Island	50.00	14.41	13.00	31.76	1000.00	0.00
30.	D & N Haveli	50.00	0.00	7.00	3.48	500.00	0.00
31.	Daman & Diu	50.00	N/R		6.44	500.00	0.00
32.	Delhi			5.00		500.00	0.00
33.	Lakshadweep	50.00	0.60		2.75	500.00	0.00
34.	Pondicherry	50.00	52.64	5.00	40.55	500.00	0.00
	TOTAL	56793.00	65248.34	184518.00	197139.25	225500.00	179632.00

SGRY : Sampooma Grameen Rozgar Yojana
IAY : Indira Awaas Yojana
SGSY : Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana
ARWSP : Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
PMGSY : Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana
IWDP : Integrated Wastelands Development Programme
DPAP : Drought Prone Areas Programme
DDP : Desert Development Programme

* For the year 2001-02 and 2002-03

DPAP, DDP and IWDP : These Schemes are demand driven, State-wise allocation is not done. The funds for approved Projects are released in 7 equal instalments. Ist instalements is Released at the time of approval of the project and other instalments are released only when 50% funds of the previous instalments are utilised. The final instalment is released only after utilisation certificates for the funds released till previous year

are received.

DR. VIJAY MALLYA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, my question was basically about accountability. Huge amount of funds are being allocated for rural development and the hon. Minister has provided a reply as well as a statement on the various vigilance and monitoring committees that have been put in place.

However, my belief is that those who live in the rural areas have not tangibly benefited by this huge expenditure. As the apex responsibility for rural development, I would assume, is in the hands of the hon. Minister, I would like to know whether he has personally supervised in any measure the actual implementation of these rural development schemes, or, whether the Central Government merely allocates money and leaves it to the States. Thereby, nobody bears the actual responsibility for the benefits that are supposed to accrue.

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL : Sir, the hon. Member has asked about the total expenditure and the performance of all the schemes of the Ministry of Rural Development. We have given a brief. We already have monitoring and vigilance agencies at different levels; district level, block level, State level and Central level. As has been pointed out, we observed that some of the Monitoring and Vigilance Committees were not functioning effectively and meaningfully. Therefore, we have formulated Monitoring and Vigilance Committees which will be represented by the Members of Parliament both of the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha, because 75 to 100 per cent money goes from the Central Government. I think all the new Committees would certainly look into the matter and improve the performance of all the programmes.

DR. VIJAY MALLYA : Sir, the hon. Minister has not answered my question. He has said that Schemes are being supervised at the block level. But the written reply says that it has been decided to dispense with the Committees at the block level. Sir, thousands of crores of rupees allocated by the Central Government are being spent. Does the Ministry of Rural Development and the Minister incharge take the responsibility to make sure that these funds are properly utilised; that there is no malpractice; that the quality of work is acceptable and that the people are actually benefited? That is my question.

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL : Mr. Chairman, Sir, all the programmes are not executed directly by the Central Government. Most of the programmes are executed by various agencies through the State

Governments. If it is at the district level, the Zilla Panchayat or the district people execute it. If it is at the State level, the State will execute it. But the Centre also carries out the overall supervision and inspection. We are strengthening the Monitoring and Vigilance Committees in respect of all the programmes, at all levels. The reply that we have given in writing is that we have formulated new Monitoring and Vigilance Committees wherein the Members of the Parliament have also been given representation.

DR. VIJAY MALLYA : Sir, that is my point. Actually, nobody is responsible. The Centre says it is the responsibility of the State and the State says it is the responsibility of the Centre. The hon. Minister is only confirming my apprehension that nobody is responsible. He is unable to say whether his Ministry is responsible or not.

SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL : Actually, we are taking every action.

श्री सभापति : माननीय मंत्री जी, सुन लें। किसी-न-किसी को तो रिस्पांसबिलिटी लेनी पड़ेगी। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट पर छोड़े, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट ब्लॉक डवलपमेंट पर छोड़े, उससे तो काम नहीं चलेगा। इसके लिए कोई-न-कोई मशीनरी आपको डवलप करनी पड़ेगी जिससे कि जितने भी फंड्स का यूटिलाइजेशन हो रहा है, उसके सही यूटिलाइजेशन की जानकारी आ जाए।

श्री अन्नासाहेब एम.के. पाटील : यह तो हम कर रहे हैं।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, there had been a great length of debate on how to improve the efficiency of the delivery of all these programmes that we have initiated. In fact, over the past few years, Rural Development, as a single head, had received the biggest allocation of funds. Both the Planning Commission as well as the National Development Council had decided that all the Centrally-sponsored schemes, particularly in areas which belong to the State List of the Constitution, must be henceforth transferred to the States. What is stopping the Government of India from transferring the Centrally-sponsored schemes to the States, alongwith the funds? What is the problem?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is a different question. This question is going on for the last 10-15 years.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU : Sir, that is the key question. We cannot have a foolproof monitoring mechanism from Delhi.

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, इसीलिए मैंने कहा कि कोई-न-कोई मशीनरी जरूर होनी चाहिए जिससे जितना रुपया खर्च होता है, उसकी सही जानकारी आ जाए।

श्री संजय निरूपम : सभापति जी, इस विषय पर इस माननीय सदन में कई बार चर्चा हुई है और कई बार चिंता व्यक्त की गई है कि केन्द्र सरकार की तरफ से जो केन्द्र की योजनाओं के लिए, विकास योजनाओं के लिए राज्यों के पास पैसे जाते हैं, उन पैसों का पूरा उपयोग नहीं होता और कई बार दुरुपयोग भी होता है। जो आंकड़े दिए गए हैं, विशेषकर महाराष्ट्र राज्य के लिए जो आंकड़े दिए गए हैं, जो उन्हें पैसा दिया गया है, निश्चित तौर पर उससे बहुत कम वहां खर्च हुआ है। ऐसी बातें सुनने में आई हैं कि महाराष्ट्र में बहुत सारा फंड जो सेंटर की तरफ से गया था उसका दुरुपयोग हुआ है या कह सकते हैं कि डायवर्सन आफ फंड हुआ है। क्या कोई ऐसा केस माननीय मंत्री जी के सामने आया है? अगर आया है तो उसमें क्या एक्शन लिया गया है? बताने की कृपा करें।

श्री अन्नासाहेब एम.के. पाटील : सर एक ही केस सामने आया था। एम्पलायमेंट जनरेशन योजना में करीब 35 करोड़ का डायवर्सन हुआ था। उसके बारे में हम लोगों ने सरकार का ध्यान दिलाया था और उसके बारे में करेक्टिव मैजर्स लेने के लिए उन्होंने हमें इन्फोर्म किया है।

Role of Electricity Regulatory Commissions

*567. DR. M.N. DAS : Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Electricity Regulatory Commissions which were created to play a crucial role in addressing crisis in the power sector has not been successful because most of the States have not yet reconciled to the concept of ERCs;

(b) if so, whether there are delays in appointments, resistance to delegating full powers to the Commissions;

(c) if so, what were the main reasons for the same;

(d) to what extent the Union Government has been able to implement the Electricity Regulatory Commissions in all States; and

(e) whether all the State Governments have been urged to implement this decision?

THE MINISTER OF POWER (SHRI ANANT GANGARAM GEETE) : (a) to (e) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) No, Sir.

(b) to (e) Constitution of State Electricity Regulatory Commission (SERC) is optional under the Electricity Regulatory Commissions Act, 1998. Section 17 of the Act provides that the State Government may